

JACK RABBIT CHASERS.

THE CONSERVATIVE remembers very distinctly a splendidly formed thoroughbred greyhound which was kept at a certain ranch not far from Kearney on the Platte in the year 1861. The owner of that dog took a friend out one day to prove his fleetness.

They had not gone far before a big jack rabbit started across the plain and the hound after him; on the course another rabbit was scared up and the dog chased him until still another was jumped, and so on all day long he chased each newly-appearing jack rabbit and at night the symmetrical and swift dog had caught not a single one!

There are a good many young men from universities and other institutions of learning in the United States who resemble that greyhound. They are able and competent enough; but they are too easily beguiled into chasing first one and then another way of making a livelihood. And when their day of life closes they will have accomplished nothing and no trophies will crown their endings.

A GOOD TIME.

Over-indulgent parents are everlastingly talking about making efforts to secure for their children "a good time." In their exuberance in this direction they express the profound opinion that it is important for children to have "a good time" now, through means of plans instituted by parental affection. With exquisite sensitiveness they eject the hope that their children may never suffer as they suffered in their childhood which was one of restraint and discipline. These parental philosophers fail to observe the fact, though it is a big one, that the restraint and discipline of their childhood and youth are the causes of their having "a good time" in middle life. As at a banquet the meats, the puddings, the dessert of nuts and fruits are more important than the soup, so in a lifetime the last years are more to be looked after and provided for as to pleasures and satisfactions than the first. It is better to wind up the game of living with a good time than with a tragedy, and a pleasant afternoon with sunshine and tranquillity is better than a beautiful morning followed by a day full of clouds and storms.

CIRCULATION.

The circulation of lead currency in Kentucky was at the ratio of precisely sixteen bullets to one corpse in the recent interchanges of regard between Colonels Colson, Scott, Golden, and a few other titled officers of the Kentucky militia, at Frankfort.

Kentucky colonels as a rule are very economical in the use of solid cereals. Very little corn in that chivalrous com-

monwealth is ever wasted in making bread. On the other hand it is saved and stored away in pure, sweet whiskey for the inspiration of those self-denying and frugal patriots who, every now and then, have a promiscuous shooting bee to show the Filipinos and other savages the beatitudes of self-government.

Kentucky is a splendid exemplar of intelligent, uncorrupted and just government by the people who shoot, for the people who shoot and of the people who shoot. The shooters and the shootees, in the Frankfort fusillade, were all "favorite sons," distinguished and extinguished citizens.

THE CENTURY.

THE CONSERVATIVE wishes to venture another calm word in the discussion, which is becoming general and heated, as to whether we are now living in the same century that we were living in last month, or in another.

THE CONSERVATIVE has often expressed its conviction that one hundred cents are required to make a dollar, and may therefore be thought to be estopped from differing with those who stand on the parallel platform, that it takes a hundred years to make a century, and who hold that the year 1900 must consequently be lumped in with 1899.

This does not seem necessarily to follow, however, if the parable of the dollar is to be taken as a guide, for the reason that dollars may be counted from any point at which one chooses to begin; if you owe a bill of ten dollars, and have paid, for instance, \$5.63 thereon, your creditor will be quite willing to begin reckoning at that point, and will freely admit that you have paid him a full dollar when your tale of pennies reaches \$6.63.

If therefore, we may be permitted to disregard this argument without seeming to give encouragement to financial fallacies, we would suggest that it would be indelicate for **THE CONSERVATIVE** to question the justness of the decision arrived at simultaneously on this point by the Pope and the German Emperor; for the relations that have hitherto existed between **THE CONSERVATIVE** office, the Vatican and the court of Berlin have been of the most harmonious character. Now both these authorities have pronounced for a new century beginning on January 1st, 1900, and have in fact closed the question, so far as themselves are concerned, by celebrating that day with appropriate ceremonies. And to ask them to hear further argument in the case, with respect to dollars or otherwise, would be to suggest that they should stultify themselves, put themselves to permanent intellectual confusion, which is a thing manifestly unthinkable *per se*, and therefore outrageous and not to be thought of for a moment.

This reason has also another bearing;

for every argument of the question, in which the disputants are not swayed by obstinacy or pride of intellect, must come to this conclusion, that the Lord only knows what century this is; and the Lord has made no sign whatever. Now in this absence of any expression from the Creator himself, whose voice can we take as the nearest possible approximation so properly as those of Pope Leo and Allerhochstderselbige Bill?

It was not these considerations, however, that brought the question to a focus with **THE CONSERVATIVE**, but a somewhat unexpected consciousness, when suddenly the habit of a lifetime had to be broken, and all letters and memoranda ticketed with a 19 instead of an 18, that a change had already taken place, and that we were in a new entourage of some sort. A moment's reflection showed that, whether the so enthusiastic mathematical demonstrators were right or wrong, we were certainly in the 19's now, whereas yesterday we were in the 18's. And do not the hundred years which are to go under the family name of the 19's make as good a century as any other?

It is, in fact, precisely the same situation which is familiar to us in the matter of decades. Of course, the ninth decade of the 19th century did not expire save with the year 1890; and yet did not each of us, as he sat down to his work on January 1st of that year and faced the unfamiliar 9, moralize somewhat over the fact that the 80's were closed and gone? And do we not, in familiar speech, allot particular occurrences to the 60's, 80's, and so on? And would not nice discrimination as to the initial and terminal year cause more confusion and vexation than any good it could accomplish?

It seems probable that what may be called the popular century will always begin with the first year bearing the new number; and that our descendants will celebrate to a considerable extent the year 2000, whereas the advent of 2001 will find them used to the sensation, and therefore comparatively unmoved. There is for that matter no reason why several centuries should not exist simultaneously, just as do the fiscal year of the government, beginning July 1st, that of many corporations, which begins February 1st, and the calendar year, which is counted from January 1st.

There is a certain unfortunate weakness in the position of those who maintain that 1900 *must* be a part of the old century, in that there is no definite starting-point for the reckoning on which they rely; except that it apparently begins with some 1st of January when Jesus Christ was three or four years old. Ostensibly reckoning from his birth, it does in fact no such thing. No such manner of calculating was